

COMPACT SUBSETS OF $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ WITH APPLICATIONS TO THE EMBEDDING OF SYMMETRIC SEQUENCE SPACES INTO $C(\alpha)$

DENNY H. LEUNG

ABSTRACT. Let $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ be the set of all finite subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, endowed with the product topology. A description of the compact subsets of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ is given. Two applications of this result to Banach space theory are shown : (1) a characterization of the symmetric sequence spaces which embed into $C(\omega^\omega)$, and (2) a characterization, in terms of the Orlicz function M , of the Orlicz sequence spaces h_M which embed into $C(K)$ for some countable compact Hausdorff space K .

If A is an arbitrary set, denote its power set by $\mathcal{P}(A)$. Identifying $\mathcal{P}(A)$ with 2^A , and endowing it with the product topology, yields a compact Hausdorff topological space. The symbols $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(A)$ and $\mathcal{P}_\infty(A)$ stand for the subspaces consisting of all finite, respectively, all infinite subsets of A . In the first part of this paper, we study the compact subsets of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$. The fruit of this study is applied in the latter part to obtain some results concerning the embedding of symmetric Banach sequence spaces into $C(K)$, where K is a countable compact Hausdorff space.

The main result in §1 is Theorem 3, which gives a description of the compact subsets of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ in terms of a certain hierarchy of subsets $(\mathcal{A}_\beta^f)$ of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ (see the definition in §1 below). The motivation for the family $(\mathcal{A}_\beta^f)$ comes from the collection of “admissible sets” used in the definition of a classical counterexample (the Schrier space [8]) in Banach space theory. Indeed, if f is the identity function on $\mathbb{N}$, then $\mathcal{A}_1^f$ is precisely the collection of “admissible sets” used to define the Schrier space. Finite iterations of the construction appears in [7]. It takes a certain amount of care, however, to extend the definition to transfinite ordinals. Careful choice is needed so that we may obtain

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 03E10, 03E15, 46B03, 46B45, 46E15, 54G12.

Key words and phrases. Countable compact sets, symmetric sequence spaces, Orlicz sequence spaces.

the monotonicity condition in Theorem 11. The technical arguments, involving the behavior of ordinal numbers, are grouped together in §2.

The remaining sections consist of certain applications of Theorem 3 to Banach space theory. Two main results are proved. The first, a combination of Theorems 12 and 21, is a characterization of the symmetric Banach sequence spaces which embed into $C(\omega^\omega)$. In particular, it is observed that every Marcinkiewicz sequence space is isomorphic to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$ (Corollary 13). The other main result, Theorem 24, is the characterization, in terms of the Orlicz function M , of the Orlicz sequence spaces h_M which embed into $C(\alpha)$ for some countable ordinal α . The argument there involves the building of blocks (see the definition in §5) which are “long” with respect to the sets in $\mathcal{A}_\beta^f$.

For terms and notation concerning ordinal numbers and general topology, we refer to [1]. The first infinite ordinal, respectively, the first uncountable ordinal, is denoted by ω , respectively, ω_1 . Any ordinal is either 0, a successor, or a limit. If α is a successor ordinal, denote its immediate predecessor by $\alpha - 1$. Following common practice, an ordinal α is identified with the set $\{\beta : \beta < \alpha\}$ of all of its predecessors. An ordinal is a Hausdorff topological space when endowed with the order topology. It is compact if and only if it is not a limit ordinal. If K is a compact Hausdorff space, $C(K)$ denotes the space of all continuous real-valued functions on K . It is a Banach space under the norm $\|f\| = \sup_{t \in K} |f(t)|$. In particular, if α is an ordinal, we write $C(\alpha)$ for the space of all continuous real-valued functions on the compact Hausdorff space $\alpha + 1$. (The notation is inconsistent, but commonly used.) Detailed discussions of such spaces can be found in [9]. It is worth pointing out that every countable compact Hausdorff space is homeomorphic to some countable compact ordinal [5]. Thus every $C(K)$, where K is countable compact, is isometric to some $C(\alpha)$, where $\alpha < \omega_1$. If K is a topological space, its *derived set* $K^{(1)}$ is the set of all of its limit points. A transfinite sequence of derived sets may be defined as follows. Let $K^{(0)} = K$. If α is an ordinal, let $K^{(\alpha+1)} = (K^{(\alpha)})^{(1)}$. Finally, for a limit ordinal α , we define $K^{(\alpha)} = \bigcap_{\beta < \alpha} K^{(\beta)}$. The cardinality of a set A is denoted by $|A|$. If A and B are nonempty subsets of $\mathbb{N}$, we say that $A < B$ if $\max A < \min B$. We also allow that $\emptyset < A$ and $A < \emptyset$ for any $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$.

We follow standard Banach space terminology, as may be found in the book [4]. We say that a Banach space is a *sequence space* if it is a vector subspace of the space of all real sequences. Such is the case, for instance, when a Banach space E has a (*Schauder*) *basis* (e_k) , i.e., every element $x \in E$ has a unique representation $x = \sum a_k e_k$ for some sequence of scalars (a_k) . Naturally, we identify every $x \in E$ with the

sequence (a_k) used in its representation. If (e_k) is a basis of a Banach space E , there is a unique sequence of bounded linear functionals (e'_k) on E such that $\langle e_j, e'_k \rangle = 1$ if $j = k$, and 0 otherwise. The sequence (e'_k) is called the sequence of *biorthogonal functionals* to the sequence (e_k) . It is a well known fact that every $x' \in E'$, the dual space of E , has a unique representation $x' = \sum a_k e'_k$, where the sum converges in the weak* topology on E' . Therefore, E' may also be regarded as a sequence space. If (e'_k) is a basis of E' (so that the foregoing sum actually converges in norm for every $x' \in E'$), then the basis (e_k) is said to be *shrinking*. If x is an element of a sequence space, let $\text{supp } x$ be the set of all coordinates k at which x is nonzero. Then we write $x < y$ to mean that $\text{supp } x < \text{supp } y$. The vector space consisting of all finitely supported real sequences is denoted by c_{00} . A basis (e_k) of a Banach space is *unconditional* if $\sum \epsilon_k a_k e_k$ converges for every choice of signs (ϵ_k) whenever $\sum a_k e_k$ converges. It is *symmetric* if $\sum a_k e_{\pi(k)}$ converges for every permutation π on $\mathbb{N}$ whenever $\sum a_k e_k$ converges. A symmetric basis is necessarily unconditional [4, §3a]. We say that it is 1-symmetric if $\|\sum \epsilon_k a_k e_{\pi(k)}\| = \|\sum a_k e_k\|$ for every choice of signs (ϵ_k) , and every permutation π on $\mathbb{N}$. Examples of Banach spaces with 1-symmetric bases are ℓ^p ($1 \leq p < \infty$), and c_0 . These norms are defined by

$$\|(a_k)\|_p = \left(\sum |a_k|^p\right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \quad \text{and} \quad \|(a_k)\|_\infty = \sup |a_k|$$

respectively. A sequence (x_k) in a Banach space is *normalized* if $\|x_k\| = 1$ for all k . Given two sequences (x_k) and (y_k) in possibly different Banach spaces, we say that they are *equivalent* if there is a finite positive constant C such that

$$C^{-1} \left\| \sum a_k x_k \right\| \leq \left\| \sum a_k y_k \right\| \leq C \left\| \sum a_k x_k \right\|$$

for every finitely supported sequence (a_k) . Two Banach spaces E and F are said to be *isomorphic* if they are linearly homeomorphic. We say that E embeds into F , $E \hookrightarrow F$, if E is isomorphic to a subspace of F .

1. A DESCRIPTION OF THE COMPACT SUBSETS OF $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$

Let I be the collection of all countable limit ordinals. If $\alpha \in I$, denote by I_α the set $\{\beta \in I : \beta < \alpha\}$. Throughout this section, fix a limit ordinal $\alpha < \omega_1$. It is shown in §2 that there is a function $b_\alpha : I_\alpha \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega_1$ such that

1. for all $\gamma \in I_\alpha$, $(b_\alpha(\gamma, n))$ strictly increases to γ ,
2. if $\gamma, \beta \in I_\alpha$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $b_\alpha(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta$, then $b_\alpha(\beta, n) < b_\alpha(\gamma, 1)$.

Let $\mathcal{F}$ be the collection of all functions $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$ which strictly increases to ∞ . For each $f \in \mathcal{F}$, define subsets $\mathcal{A}_\beta^f$ of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ inductively

for all $\beta < \alpha$ as follows. Let $\mathcal{A}_0^f = \{A \subseteq \mathbb{N} : |A| \leq 1\}$. If $\beta < \alpha$, and $\mathcal{A}_\gamma^f$ is defined for all $\gamma < \beta$, let

$$\mathcal{A}_\beta^f = \{A = \cup_{i=1}^k A_i : A_1 < \cdots < A_k, \quad A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta-1}^f, \quad k \leq f(\min A)\}$$

if β is a successor ordinal. If β is a limit ordinal, let

$$\mathcal{A}_\beta^f = \{A : A \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A))}^f\}.$$

It follows from the definition of the sets $\mathcal{A}_\beta^f$ and the properties of the function b_α that

$$\mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n)}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n)+1}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n+1)}^f \quad (1)$$

for all $\beta \in I_\alpha$, and all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. (See Theorem 11 in §2.) We will use the sets $\mathcal{A}_\beta^f$ to describe the compact subsets of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ up to the level of “complexity” α . A subset S of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$ is said to be *hereditary* if $A \subseteq B \in S$ implies that $A \in S$. We leave it to the reader to check that if K is a hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$, then so is $K^{(\alpha)}$ for any ordinal α .

Proposition 1. *For each $\beta < \alpha$, $\mathcal{A}_\beta^f$ is a hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$.*

Proof. Induct on β . The result clearly holds for $\beta = 0$. Now assume that $0 < \beta < \alpha$, and the result holds for all $\gamma < \beta$. Suppose that $B \subseteq A \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$. If β is a successor, express A as $\cup_{i=1}^k A_i$, where $A_1 < \cdots < A_k$, $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta-1}^f$, and $k \leq f(\min A)$. Let $B_i = A_i \cap B$ for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then $B_i \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta-1}^f$ since $\mathcal{A}_{\beta-1}^f$ is hereditary. Also, $f(\min A) \leq f(\min B)$. It follows easily that $B = \cup_{i=1}^k B_i \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$. If β is a limit ordinal, then $A \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A))}^f$. Since $b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A)) < \beta$, $\mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A))}^f$ is hereditary. Therefore, $B \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A))}^f$. However, since $f(\min A) \leq f(\min B)$, we deduce from the relation (1) that $\mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A))}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min B))}^f$. Thus $B \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min B))}^f$, i.e., $B \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$. This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Proposition 2. *Let f, g be two functions in $\mathcal{F}$, and suppose $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, $\beta < \alpha$. If $f(k) \geq g(k)$ for all $k \geq k_0$, and A is an element of $\mathcal{A}_\beta^g$ such that $\min A \geq k_0$, then $A \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$.*

Proof. The proof is once again by induction on β . Since $\mathcal{A}_0^g = \mathcal{A}_0^f$, the result holds for $\beta = 0$. Now suppose $0 < \beta < \alpha$, and the Proposition holds for all $\gamma < \beta$. Let $A \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^g$, $\min A \geq k_0$. If β is a successor, then $A = \cup_{i=1}^k A_i$, where $A_1 < \cdots < A_k$, $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta-1}^g$, and $k \leq g(\min A)$. Since $\min A_i \geq \min A \geq k_0$ for all i , $A_i \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta-1}^f$ by

the inductive hypothesis. Also, observe that $f(\min A) \geq g(\min A)$. Hence the above decomposition of A shows that $A \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$. On the other hand, if β is a limit ordinal, then $A \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, g(\min A))}^g$. It follows from the relation (1) and the fact that $f(\min A) \geq g(\min A)$ that $\mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, g(\min A))}^g \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A))}^g$. Therefore, $A \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A))}^g$. As $b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A)) < \beta$, we obtain from the inductive hypothesis that $A \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A))}^f$. Hence $A \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$, as desired. $\square$

Theorem 3. *Let K be a compact, hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $K^{(\omega^{\beta+1})} = \emptyset$ for some ordinal $\beta < \alpha$. For all $C \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(\mathbb{N})$, there exist $B \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(C)$, and a function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$ for all $A \in K$.*

We prove Theorem 3 by induction on the ordinal β . The main step, going from β to $\beta + 1$, requires an induction of its own. First, we introduce some more notation. Recall the sets $\mathcal{A}_\beta^f$ defined above. For any $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, let

$$\mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^f = \{A = \cup_{i=1}^k A_i : A_1 < \dots < A_k, \quad A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f, \quad k \leq 3^m\}.$$

If $K \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$, and $A \subseteq \mathbb{N}$, let $K_A = \{B \in K : A \subseteq B\}$. Also, for any subset A of $\mathbb{N}$ and any $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $A(< n)$, respectively $A(n)$, be the intersection of A with the integer interval $[1, n)$, respectively, $[1, n]$.

Lemma 4. *Let K be a compact, hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$, and let γ be a countable ordinal. If $A \in K \setminus K^{(\gamma)}$, and $\emptyset \in K^{(\gamma)}$, then there exists $a \in A$ such that $A(< a) \in K^{(\gamma)}$, and $A(a) \notin K^{(\gamma)}$. Moreover, $(K_A)^{(\gamma)} = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Write $A = \{n_1, \dots, n_l\}$, where $n_1 < n_2 < \dots < n_l$. Define $F_0 = \emptyset$, and $F_k = \{n_1, \dots, n_k\}$, $1 \leq k \leq l$. Let k_0 be the smallest integer such that $F_{k_0} \notin K^{(\gamma)}$. Such a k_0 exists since $F_l = A \notin K^{(\gamma)}$. Set $a = n_{k_0}$. Clearly, $A(< a) \in K^{(\gamma)}$, and $A(a) \notin K^{(\gamma)}$. Now if $B \in (K_A)^{(\gamma)}$, then $A \subseteq B \in K^{(\gamma)}$. Hence $A \in K^{(\gamma)}$, a contradiction. $\square$

Lemma 5. *Suppose that Theorem 3 holds for some ordinal $\beta < \alpha$. If K is a compact, hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $K^{(\omega^{\beta \cdot 2^m + 1})} = \emptyset$ for some $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$, then for all $C \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(\mathbb{N})$, there exist $B \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(C)$, and a function $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^f$ for all $A \in K$.*

Proof. We induct on m . When $m = 0$, the statement is simply Theorem 3 for the ordinal β . Now assume that the lemma holds for some $m \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. Let K be a compact, hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $K^{(\omega^{\beta \cdot 2^{m+1} + 1})} = \emptyset$, and suppose that $C \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(\mathbb{N})$ is given. We may

obviously assume that $K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m + 1)} \neq \emptyset$. Since $(K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)})^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m + 1)} = \emptyset$, we may apply the inductive hypothesis to the set $K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)}$ to obtain a set $C_0 \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(C)$, and a function $f_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A \cap C_0 \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^{f_0}$ whenever $A \in K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)}$. It remains to consider the behavior of the sets A in $K \setminus K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)}$. Pick any $c_0 \in C_0$, and let $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{S \in K \setminus K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)} : \max S = c_0\}$. Clearly $\mathcal{S}_0$ is finite. If $\mathcal{S}_0 = \emptyset$, let $C_1 = C_0 \setminus \{c_0\}$, and $f_1 = f_0$. If $\mathcal{S}_0 \neq \emptyset$, list its elements as $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{S_1, \dots, S_l\}$. Using the fact that $(K_{S_i})^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m + 1)} = \emptyset$, and the inductive hypothesis, we obtain sets

$$C_0 \setminus \{c_0\} \supseteq C_0(S_1) \supseteq \dots \supseteq C_0(S_l)$$

in $\mathcal{P}_\infty(\mathbb{N})$, and functions $g_1, \dots, g_l \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A \cap C_0(S_i) \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^{g_i}$ whenever $A \in K_{S_i}$. Choose $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f_1(k) \geq \max\{g_1(k), \dots, g_l(k)\}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$, and let $C_1 = C_0(S_l)$. If $A \in K_{S_i}$ for some i , represent $A \cap C_0(S_i)$ as

$$A \cap C_0(S_i) = \cup_{j=1}^k D_j,$$

where $D_1 < \dots < D_k$, $D_1, \dots, D_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta}^{g_i}$, and $k \leq 3^m$. But since $f_1 \geq g_i$ for all i , $\mathcal{A}_{\beta}^{g_i} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\beta}^{f_1}$ by Proposition 2. Also $\mathcal{A}_{\beta}^{f_1}$ is hereditary by Proposition 1. Hence $D_j \cap C_1 \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta}^{f_1}$ for all j . The representation $A \cap C_1 = \cup_{j=1}^k (D_j \cap C_1)$ shows that $A \cap C_1 \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^{f_1}$. Inductively, if $k \geq 1$, pick $c_k \in C_k$, $c_k > c_{k-1}$. If

$$\mathcal{S}_k = \{S \in K \setminus K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)} : \max S = c_k\} = \emptyset,$$

let $C_{k+1} = C_k \setminus \{c_k\}$, and $f_{k+1} = f_k$. Otherwise, repeating the argument above, we obtain $C_{k+1} \subseteq C_k \setminus \{c_k\}$, and $f_{k+1} \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $A \in K_S$ for some $S \in \mathcal{S}_k$ implies $A \cap C_{k+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^{f_{k+1}}$. Now let $B = \{c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots\}$. Then $B \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(C)$. Choose $f \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $f(k) \geq \max\{f_0(k), f_1(k), \dots, f_k(k)\}$ for all k . Suppose $A \in K$. If $A \cap B \in K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)}$, then

$$A \cap B = A \cap B \cap C_0 \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^{f_0} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^f$$

by Proposition 2. Since obviously $\mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m+1}^f$, the proof is complete in this case. If $A \cap B \notin K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)}$, apply Lemma 4 to obtain $c_k \in A \cap B$ such that $(A \cap B)(< c_k) \in K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)}$, but $(A \cap B)(c_k) \notin K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)}$. Let $D_1 = (A \cap B)(< c_k)$, $D_2 = \{c_k\}$, and $D_3 = (A \cap B) \setminus (D_1 \cup D_2)$. Now $D_1 \in K^{(\omega^\beta \cdot 2^m)}$ implies that $D_1 = D_1 \cap C_0 \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^{f_0} \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^f$. Also, $D_1 \cup D_2 \in \mathcal{S}_k$, and $A \cap B \in K_{D_1 \cup D_2}$. From the choices of C_{k+1} and f_{k+1} , we conclude that

$$D_3 = A \cap B \cap C_{k+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^{f_{k+1}}.$$

Since $\min D_3 \geq c_{k+1} \geq k+1$, and $f(j) \geq f_{k+1}(j)$ for all $j \geq k+1$, $D_3 \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m}^f$ by Proposition 2. Obviously, $D_2 \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta}^f$ as well. Since $A \cap B = D_1 \cup D_2 \cup D_3$, and $D_1 < D_2 < D_3$, it follows immediately that $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m+1}^f$. $\square$

The next result is the inductive step from β to $\beta+1$ in Theorem 3.

Lemma 6. *If Theorem 3 holds for some ordinal $\beta < \alpha$, then it also holds for $\beta+1$.*

Proof. Suppose Theorem 3 holds for some ordinal $\beta < \alpha$. Then Lemma 5 is applicable. Let K be a compact, hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $K^{(\omega^{\beta+1}+1)} = \emptyset$, and suppose that $C \in \mathcal{P}_{\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ is given. If there exists $B \in \mathcal{P}_{\infty}(C)$ such that $B \cap (\cup_{A \in K} A) = \emptyset$, the result is trivial. We may thus assume otherwise. Since $K^{(\omega^{\beta+1})}$ is finite, we can choose $c_1 \in C$, $c_1 > \max(\cup\{A : A \in K^{(\omega^{\beta+1})}\})$, and $c_1 \in \cup_{A \in K} A$. Now $(K_{\{c_1\}})^{(\omega^{\beta+1})} = \emptyset$, hence $(K_{\{c_1\}})^{(\omega^{\beta} \cdot 2^{m_1} + 1)} = \emptyset$ for some $m_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 5, there exist $C_1 \in \mathcal{P}_{\infty}(C \setminus \{c_1\})$, and a function $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A \cap C_1 \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m_1}^{f_1}$ for all $A \in K_{\{c_1\}}$. If C_n and c_n have been chosen, let $c_{n+1} > c_n$, $c_{n+1} \in C_n$, $c_{n+1} \in \cup_{A \in K} A$. Then $c_{n+1} > c_1$; hence $(K_{\{c_{n+1}\}})^{(\omega^{\beta+1})} = \emptyset$. Therefore $(K_{\{c_{n+1}\}})^{(\omega^{\beta} \cdot 2^{m_{n+1}} + 1)} = \emptyset$ for some $m_{n+1} \in \mathbb{N}$. By Lemma 5, we obtain $C_{n+1} \in \mathcal{P}_{\infty}(C_n \setminus \{c_{n+1}\})$, and a function $f_{n+1} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A \cap C_{n+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m_{n+1}}^{f_{n+1}}$ for all $A \in K_{\{c_{n+1}\}}$. Let $B = \{c_1, c_2, \dots\}$, and let $f \in \mathcal{F}$ be such that $f(j) \geq \max\{f_1(j), \dots, f_j(j), 2^{m_j} + 1\}$ for all j . Then $B \in \mathcal{P}_{\infty}(C)$. Suppose $A \in K$. Let $\min(A \cap B) = c_j$. Then $A \cap B \in K_{\{c_j\}}$; hence $(A \cap B) \setminus \{c_j\} = A \cap B \cap C_j \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m_j}^{f_j}$. Since $\min((A \cap B) \setminus \{c_j\}) \geq c_{j+1} \geq j+1$, and $f(k) \geq f_j(k)$ for all $k \geq j+1$, $(A \cap B) \setminus \{c_j\} \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta, m_j}^f$ by Proposition 2. Therefore,

$$(A \cap B) \setminus \{c_j\} = \cup_{i=1}^k D_i, \quad D_1 < \dots < D_k, \quad D_1, \dots, D_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta}^f, \quad k \leq 2^{m_j}.$$

Let $E_1 = \{c_j\}$, $E_i = D_{i-1}$ for $2 \leq i \leq k+1$. Then

$$A \cap B = \cup_{i=1}^{k+1} E_i, \quad E_1 < \dots < E_{k+1}, \quad E_1, \dots, E_{k+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta}^f.$$

Since $k+1 \leq 2^{m_j} + 1 \leq f(j) \leq f(c_j) = f(\min(A \cap B))$, we conclude that $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta+1}^f$. $\square$

Proof of Theorem 3. As indicated before, the proof is by induction on the ordinal β . First consider the case when $\beta = 0$. Let K be a compact, hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $K^{(2)} = K^{(\omega^0+1)} = \emptyset$. Also suppose that $C \in \mathcal{P}_{\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ is given. We may assume that for all $B \in \mathcal{P}_{\infty}(C)$, $B \cap (\cup_{A \in K} A) \neq \emptyset$. Now $K^{(1)}$ is finite. Hence there exists $c_1 \in C \cap (\cup_{A \in K} A)$ such that $c_1 > \max(\cup_{A \in K^{(1)}} A)$. For any

$c \in C \cap (\cup_{A \in K} A)$, $c \geq c_1$, $(K_{\{c\}})^{(1)} = \emptyset$. Thus $K_{\{c\}}$ is finite. Therefore, there exists $c' \in C \cap (\cup_{A \in K} A)$ such that $c' > \max(\cup_{A \in K_{\{c\}}} A)$. Using this observation, we can choose a strictly increasing sequence (c_n) in $C \cap (\cup_{A \in K} A)$ such that $c_{n+1} > \max(\cup_{A \in K_{\{c_n\}}} A)$. Let $B = \{c_n : n \in \mathbb{N}\}$. Then $B \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(C)$. If $A \in K$, then $A \cap B \in K$. Let $\min(A \cap B) = c_j$. Since $A \cap B \in K_{\{c_j\}}$, and $c_n > \max(\cup_{A \in K_{\{c_j\}}} A)$ for all $n > j$, we see that $A \cap B = \{c_j\}$. Therefore, $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}_0^f$ for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$.

Now suppose $\beta < \alpha$, and the theorem has been proven for all ordinals $\gamma < \beta$. If β is a successor ordinal, we appeal to Lemma 6 to finish the proof. Otherwise, β is a limit ordinal. Let K be a compact, hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $K^{(\omega^\beta+1)} = \emptyset$, and let $C \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(\mathbb{N})$ be given. Once again, we assume without loss of generality that $B \cap (\cup_{A \in K} A) \neq \emptyset$ for all $B \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(C)$. Since $K^{(\omega^\beta)}$ is finite, there exists $c_1 \in C \cap (\cup_{A \in K} A)$ such that $c_1 > \max(\cup\{A : A \in K^{(\omega^\beta)}\})$. Then $(K_{\{c_1\}})^{(\omega^\beta)} = \emptyset$. Hence $K^{(\omega^{b_\alpha(\beta, n_1)+1})} = \emptyset$ for some $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$. As $b_\alpha(\beta, n_1) < \beta$, we may apply the inductive hypothesis to obtain $C_1 \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(C \setminus \{c_1\})$ and a function $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}$ such that $A \cap C_1 \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n_1)}^{f_1}$ for all $A \in K_{\{c_1\}}$. If C_k and c_k have been chosen, let $c_{k+1} \in C \cap (\cup_{A \in K} A)$ be such that $c_{k+1} > c_k$. Then $(K_{\{c_{k+1}\}})^{(\omega^\beta)} = \emptyset$. Hence there exist $n_{k+1} \in \mathbb{N}$, $C_{k+1} \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(C_k \setminus \{c_{k+1}\})$, and a function $f_{k+1} \in \mathcal{F}$ such that

$$A \cap C_{k+1} \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n_{k+1})}^{f_{k+1}} \quad \text{for all } A \in K_{\{c_{k+1}\}}.$$

Now let $B = \{c_1, c_2, \dots\}$, and pick $f \in \mathcal{F}$ so that $f(j) \geq \max\{f_1(1), \dots, f_j(j), n_j + 1\}$ for all j . Suppose $A \in K$, and $\min(A \cap B) = c_k$. As $A \cap B \in K_{\{c_k\}}$,

$$(A \cap B) \setminus \{c_k\} = A \cap B \cap C_k \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n_k)}^{f_k}.$$

Since $\min((A \cap B) \setminus \{c_k\}) \geq c_{k+1} \geq k+1$, and $f(j) \geq f_k(j)$ for all $j \geq k+1$, $(A \cap B) \setminus \{c_k\} \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n_k)}^f$ by Proposition 2. Now let $D_1 = \{c_j\}$, $D_2 = (A \cap B) \setminus \{c_j\}$. Then $D_1 < D_2$, and $D_1, D_2 \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n_k)}^f$. Also, $f(\min(A \cap B)) \geq f(1) \geq 2$. Therefore, $A \cap B = D_1 \cup D_2 \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n_k)+1}^f$. Finally, since $f(\min(A \cap B)) = f(c_k) \geq n_k + 1$, it follows from the relation (1) that $\mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n_k)+1}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min(A \cap B)))}^f$. Hence $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min(A \cap B)))}^f$, i.e., $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$. This completes the proof of the theorem. $\square$

Remark. We leave it to the reader to check that $\mathcal{A}_\beta^f$ is a compact, hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $(\mathcal{A}_\beta^f)^{(\omega^\beta+1)} = \emptyset$. Therefore, the description of K given in Theorem 3 is sharp except for the fact that we have to pass to an infinite subset B .

2. CONSTRUCTION OF THE FUNCTION b_α

In this section, we give the construction of the function b_α used in §1. The crucial step is given in Lemma 8.

Proposition 7. *There is a continuous order isomorphism h from ω_1 onto I .*

Proof. Since I is a cofinal subset of ω_1 , there is an order isomorphism h from ω_1 onto I . We claim that h is continuous. Indeed, let (α_n) be a sequence of countable ordinals which strictly increases to some α . Then $(h(\alpha_n))$ strictly increases to some $\beta < \omega_1$. Clearly, $\beta \in I$. Say $\beta = h(\gamma)$. Since $h(\alpha) \geq h(\alpha_n)$ for all n , $h(\alpha) \geq h(\gamma)$. Hence $\alpha \geq \gamma$. But if $\gamma < \alpha$, then there exists n such that $\gamma < \alpha_n$. This implies that $\beta = h(\gamma) < h(\alpha_n)$, which is impossible. Therefore, $\gamma = \alpha$. This shows that h is continuous on ω_1 . $\square$

Lemma 8. *For every $\alpha \in I$, there is a function $c_\alpha : I_\alpha \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega_1$ such that for all $\gamma \in I_\alpha$,*

1. *the sequence $(c_\alpha(\gamma, n))$ strictly increases to γ ,*
2. *$\sup\{c_\alpha(\beta, n) : (\beta, n) \in I_\alpha \times \mathbb{N}, c_\alpha(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta\} < \gamma$.*

(Here, we let $\sup \emptyset = 0$.)

Proof. We induct on the elements of I . The result holds vacuously for $\min I = \omega$, since $I_\omega = \emptyset$. Now suppose $\omega < \alpha_0 \in I$, and functions c_α are found for all $\alpha \in I_{\alpha_0}$ satisfying conditions (1) and (2). We want to show that the result also holds for α_0 . Using the function h from Proposition 7, write $\alpha_0 = h(\beta_0)$. Then $0 < \beta_0 < \omega_1$. We consider 3 separate cases.

Case 1. β_0 is a successor and $\beta_0 - 1$ is not a limit.

Define $c_{\alpha_0} : I_{\alpha_0} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega_1$ by

$$c_{\alpha_0}(\gamma, n) = \begin{cases} c_{h(\beta_0-1)}(\gamma, n) & \text{if } \gamma \in I_{h(\beta_0-1)}, \\ h(\beta_0 - 2) + n & \text{if } \gamma = h(\beta_0 - 1). \end{cases}$$

Here, we let $h(\beta_0 - 2) = 0$ if $\beta_0 - 1 = 0$. If $\gamma \in I_{h(\beta_0-1)}$, then condition (1) holds by the inductive choice of $c_{h(\beta_0-1)}$. Consider condition (2). If $\beta = h(\beta_0 - 1)$, then $c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) > \gamma$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup\{c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) : (\beta, n) \in I_{\alpha_0} \times \mathbb{N}, c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta\} \\ &= \sup\{c_{h(\beta_0-1)}(\beta, n) : (\beta, n) \in I_{h(\beta_0-1)} \times \mathbb{N}, c_{h(\beta_0-1)}(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta\} < \gamma \end{aligned}$$

by the inductive choice of $c_{h(\beta_0-1)}$. Thus condition (2) holds if $\gamma \in I_{h(\beta_0-1)}$. Finally, if $\gamma = h(\beta_0 - 1)$, then clearly $\gamma = h(\beta_0 - 2) + \omega$. Thus

condition (1) holds. Moreover, there is no $\beta \in I_{\alpha_0}$ such that $\beta > \gamma$. So condition (2) also holds.

Case 2. β_0 is a successor and $\beta_0 - 1$ is a limit.

Choose a sequence of ordinals (τ_n) which strictly increases to $\beta_0 - 1$. Define $c_{\alpha_0} : I_{\alpha_0} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega_1$ by

$$c_{\alpha_0}(\gamma, n) = \begin{cases} c_{h(\beta_0-1)}(\gamma, n) & \text{if } \gamma \in I_{h(\beta_0-1)}, \\ h(\tau_n) & \text{if } \gamma = h(\beta_0 - 1). \end{cases}$$

It is clear by the definition of c_{α_0} that condition (1) holds. If $\gamma \in I_{h(\beta_0-1)}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \sup\{c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) : (\beta, n) \in I_{\alpha_0} \times \mathbb{N}, c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta\} = \\ \max\left\{\sup\{c_{h(\beta_0-1)}(\beta, n) : (\beta, n) \in I_{h(\beta_0-1)} \times \mathbb{N}, c_{h(\beta_0-1)}(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta\}, \right. \\ \left. \sup\{h(\tau_n) : n \in \mathbb{N}, h(\tau_n) < \gamma\}\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The first supremum on the right is $< \gamma$ by the inductive choice of $c_{h(\beta_0-1)}$. The second supremum on the right is also $< \gamma$ because $(h(\tau_n))$ strictly increases to $h(\beta_0 - 1)$, and $\gamma < h(\beta_0 - 1)$. Thus condition (2) is verified if $\gamma \in I_{h(\beta_0-1)}$. On the other hand, if $\gamma = h(\beta_0 - 1)$, there is no $\beta \in I_{\alpha_0}$ such that $\beta > \gamma$. Hence condition (2) is fulfilled trivially.

Case 3. β_0 is a limit ordinal.

Choose a sequence of ordinals (τ_k) which increases to β_0 , such that $\tau_k + 2 < \tau_{k+1}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $k \in \mathbb{N}$, $\gamma \in I$, and $h(\tau_k + 2) \leq \gamma \leq h(\tau_{k+1})$, then $\gamma \in I_{h(\tau_{k+1}+1)}$. Since $h(\tau_{k+1}+1) \in I_{\alpha_0}$, by the inductive hypothesis, $c_{h(\tau_{k+1}+1)}(\gamma, n)$ increases to γ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. But $\gamma \geq h(\tau_k + 2) > h(\tau_k + 1)$. Therefore, there exists $n_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c_{h(\tau_{k+1}+1)}(\gamma, n) > h(\tau_k + 1)$ if $n > n_\gamma$. Define $c_{\alpha_0} : I_{\alpha_0} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega_1$ as follows:

$$c_{\alpha_0}(\gamma, n) = \begin{cases} c_{h(\tau_1+1)}(\gamma, n) & \text{if } \gamma \leq h(\tau_1), \\ h(\tau_k) + n & \text{if } \gamma = h(\tau_k + 1), k \in \mathbb{N}, \\ c_{h(\tau_{k+1}+1)}(\gamma, n + n_\gamma) & \text{if } h(\tau_k + 2) \leq \gamma \leq h(\tau_{k+1}), k \in \mathbb{N}. \end{cases}$$

Let $\gamma \in I_{\alpha_0}$, if $\gamma \leq h(\tau_1)$, or if $h(\tau_k + 2) \leq \gamma \leq h(\tau_{k+1})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$. Then $(c_{\alpha_0}(\gamma, n))$ strictly increases to γ by the inductive choices of $c_{h(\tau_1+1)}$ and $c_{h(\tau_{k+1}+1)}$ respectively. On the other hand, if $\gamma = h(\tau_k + 1)$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $(c_{\alpha_0}(\gamma, n))$ increases to γ , since $\gamma = h(\tau_k + 1) = h(\tau_k) + \omega$. This verifies condition (1) for the function c_{α_0} . To check condition (2), first observe that if $\beta \in I_{\alpha_0}$, and $h(\tau_k + 2) \leq \beta \leq h(\tau_{k+1})$ for some $k \in \mathbb{N}$, then $c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) > h(\tau_k + 1)$ by the choice of n_β . It is also clear that if $\beta = h(\tau_k + 1)$ for some k , then $c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) > h(\tau_k)$. Using

these observations, we deduce that if $\gamma, \beta \in I_{\alpha_0}$, and $c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta$, then

$$\beta \leq \begin{cases} h(\tau_1) & \text{if } \gamma \leq h(\tau_1), \\ h(\tau_{k+1}) & \text{if } h(\tau_k + 2) \leq \gamma \leq h(\tau_{k+1}), \end{cases}$$

while no such β exists if $\gamma = h(\tau_k + 1)$ for some k . Therefore, given $\gamma \in I_{\alpha_0}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \{c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) : (\beta, n) \in I_{\alpha_0} \times \mathbb{N}, c_{\alpha_0}(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta\} \\ &= \begin{cases} \{c_{h(\tau_1+1)}(\beta, n) : (\beta, n) \in I_{h(\tau_1+1)} \times \mathbb{N}, c_{h(\tau_1+1)}(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta\}, \\ \emptyset, \\ \{c_{h(\tau_{k+1}+1)}(\beta, n + n_\beta) : (\beta, n) \in I_{h(\tau_{k+1}+1)} \times \mathbb{N}, c_{h(\tau_{k+1}+1)}(\beta, n + n_\beta) < \gamma < \beta\}. \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$

according to whether $\gamma \leq h(\tau_1)$, $\gamma = h(\tau_k + 1)$, or $h(\tau_k + 2) \leq \gamma \leq h(\tau_{k+1})$ for some k . Using the inductive properties of the functions $c_{h(\tau_1+1)}$ and $c_{h(\tau_{k+1}+1)}$, we deduce easily that c_{α_0} satisfies condition (2). $\square$

Theorem 9. *For every $\alpha \in I$, there is a function $b_\alpha : I_\alpha \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega_1$ such that*

1. *for all $\gamma \in I_\alpha$, $(b_\alpha(\gamma, n))$ strictly increases to γ ,*
2. *if $\gamma, \beta \in I_\alpha$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $b_\alpha(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta$, then $b_\alpha(\beta, n) < b_\alpha(\gamma, 1)$.*

Proof. Given $\alpha \in I$, obtain a function $c_\alpha : I_\alpha \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega_1$ using Lemma 8. If $\gamma \in I_\alpha$, let

$$\tau_\gamma = \sup\{c_\alpha(\beta, n) : (\beta, n) \in I_\alpha \times \mathbb{N}, c_\alpha(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta\}.$$

Then $\tau_\gamma < \gamma$ by Lemma 8. Also $(c_\alpha(\gamma, n))$ increases to γ . Hence, there exists $m_\gamma \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $c_\alpha(\gamma, n) > \tau_\gamma$ if $n > m_\gamma$. Define $b_\alpha : I_\alpha \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \omega_1$ by $b_\alpha(\gamma, n) = c_\alpha(\gamma, n + m_\gamma)$. Condition (1) of the theorem follows from condition (1) of Lemma 8. Now suppose $\gamma, \beta \in I_\alpha$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$, and $b_\alpha(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta$. Then

$$c_\alpha(\beta, n + m_\beta) = b_\alpha(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta.$$

It follows from the definition of τ_γ that $b_\alpha(\beta, n) \leq \tau_\gamma$. But

$$\tau_\gamma < c_\alpha(\gamma, 1 + m_\gamma) = b_\alpha(\gamma, 1).$$

This proves condition (2). $\square$

From now on, fix a collection of functions $\{b_\alpha : \alpha \in I\}$ satisfying the conditions of Theorem 9.

Corollary 10. *Let $\alpha \in I$. Define $p : \alpha \setminus \{0\} \rightarrow \omega_1$ by*

$$p(\beta) = \begin{cases} b_\alpha(\beta, 1) & \text{if } \beta \text{ is a limit ordinal,} \\ \beta - 1 & \text{if } \beta \text{ is a successor ordinal.} \end{cases}$$

If $\beta \in I_\alpha$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1 = p^k(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1))$.

Proof. Clearly, if $p^k(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1)) \neq 0$, then $p^k(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1)) > p^{k+1}(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1))$. Let

$$J = \{k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\} : p^k(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1)) \geq b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1\}.$$

Obviously, $0 \in J$. Since every strictly decreasing sequence of ordinals is finite, J is a finite set. Let $j_0 = \max J$, and denote $p^{j_0}(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1))$ by γ . By definition, $\gamma \geq b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1$. If γ is a successor, then $p(\gamma) = \gamma - 1 < b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1$. Hence $\gamma = b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1$. On the other hand, if γ is a limit ordinal, then $b_\alpha(\beta, n) < \gamma < \beta$. Therefore, $b_\alpha(\beta, n) < b_\alpha(\gamma, 1) = p(\gamma)$ by the properties of b_α . But then $j_0 + 1 \in J$, contrary to the choice of j_0 . Thus, it must be that $\gamma = p^{j_0}(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1)) = b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1$. $\square$

Theorem 11. *If $\alpha \in I$, $\beta \in I_\alpha$, and $n \in \mathbb{N}$, then for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$,*

$$\mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n)}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1)}^f.$$

Proof. Observe that if $\gamma \in I_\alpha$, then $\mathcal{A}_\gamma^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{\gamma+1}^f$. We prove the second inclusion by induction on the elements of I_α . First consider the case when $\beta = \min I_\alpha = \omega$. Then every $b_\alpha(\beta, m)$ is a finite ordinal. Thus, there exists $j \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1) = b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1 + j$. It follows readily from the above observation that $\mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1)}^f$. Now suppose $\beta \in I_\alpha$, and $\mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\gamma, n) + 1}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\gamma, n + 1)}^f$ for all $\gamma \in I_\beta$. We claim that if γ is *any* ordinal such that $0 < \gamma < \beta$, then $\mathcal{A}_{p(\gamma)}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_\gamma^f$, where p is the function defined in Corollary 10. Indeed, if γ is a successor, the statement is simply the observation made at the beginning of the proof. On the other hand, if γ is a limit ordinal, then

$$\mathcal{A}_{p(\gamma)}^f = \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\gamma, 1)}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\gamma, 1) + 1}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\gamma, 2)}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\gamma, 2) + 1}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\gamma, 3)}^f \subseteq \cdots$$

Hence $\mathcal{A}_{p(\gamma)}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\gamma, m)}^f$ for all m . In particular, if $A \in \mathcal{A}_{p(\gamma)}^f$, then $A \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\gamma, f(\min A))}^f$, i.e., $A \in \mathcal{A}_\gamma^f$. This proves the claim. By Corollary 10, there exists $k \in \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$ such that $b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1 = p^k(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1))$. Clearly, $p^j(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1)) < \beta$ whenever $0 \leq j \leq k$. Thus we can conclude from the claim that

$$\mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n) + 1}^f = \mathcal{A}_{p^k(b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1))}^f \subseteq \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n + 1)}^f,$$

as required. $\square$

3. AN EMBEDDING RESULT

In this section, we prove a general result which shows that members of a certain class of symmetric sequence spaces can be embedded into $C(\omega^\omega)$. This class includes the Marcinkiewicz sequence spaces. We also prove that it includes all Orlicz sequence spaces h_M such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} M(\eta t)/M(t) = 0$ for some $\eta > 0$. A norm ρ defined on a vector lattice E is a *lattice norm* if $\rho(x) \leq \rho(y)$ whenever $x, y \in E$ and $|x| \leq |y|$. We also say that a norm ρ on $\mathbb{R}^n$ is *normalized* if $\|\cdot\|_\infty \leq \rho \leq \|\cdot\|_1$. If $a = (a_n)$ is a finite real sequence, or an infinite real sequence which converges to 0, we let $a^* = (a_n^*)$ denote the decreasing rearrangement of the sequence $(|a_n|)$.

Theorem 12. *Suppose that (t_n) is a strictly positive real sequence which decreases to 0, and for each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, ρ_n is a normalized lattice norm on $\mathbb{R}^n$. If a Banach space E has a basis (e_k) such that*

$$\left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| = \sup_n t_n \rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_n^*) \quad (2)$$

for every element $\sum a_k e_k \in E$, then E is isomorphic to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$.

Proof. For each n , denote by B_n the unit ball of the dual of $(\mathbb{R}^n, \rho_n)$. Since ρ_n is normalized, $\|b\|_\infty \leq 1$ if $b \in B_n$. Choose a finite subset A_n of B_n consisting of decreasing sequences so that if $a \in \mathbb{R}^n$, then

$$\frac{1}{2} \rho_n(a^*) \leq \sup_{b \in A_n} \langle a^*, b \rangle \leq \rho_n(a^*). \quad (3)$$

Let K_n be the set of all $c \in \mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$ such that either $c = 0$, or there are a $b = (b_k) \in A_n$, and $1 \leq k_1 < k_2 < \dots < k_i \leq n$ such that $c^* = t_n(b_{k_1}, \dots, b_{k_i}, 0, \dots)$. Endow $\mathbb{R}^\mathbb{N}$ with the topology of pointwise convergence. Then each K_n is a compact subset. Let $\mathcal{P}_n(\mathbb{N}) = \{A \subseteq \mathbb{N} : |A| \leq n\}$. Since $(\mathcal{P}_n(\mathbb{N}))^{(m)} = \emptyset$ for $m > n$, and A_n is finite, we see that $(K_n)^{(m)} = \emptyset$ if $m > n$. Let $K = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty K_n$. We claim that K is pointwise compact. Indeed, if $c \in \overline{K} \setminus \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \overline{K_n}$, then for any $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$, and all $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $d = (d_k) \in K \setminus \bigcup_{j=1}^n K_j$ such that $|c_k - d_k| < \epsilon$. Hence

$$|c_k| < |d_k| + \epsilon \leq \|d\|_\infty + \epsilon \leq t_{n+1} + \epsilon.$$

Since k, n and ϵ are arbitrary, $c_k = 0$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$. But then $c = 0 \in \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty K_n$, a contradiction. Thus

$$\overline{K} = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty \overline{K_n} = \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty K_n = K.$$

So K is pointwise closed. Since K is coordinatewise bounded, it is pointwise compact. Repeating the above proof shows that

$$K^{(m)} = \bigcup_{n=1}^{\infty} (K_n)^{(m)} = \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} (K_n)^{(m)} \subseteq \bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} K_n.$$

Therefore,

$$K^{(\omega)} = \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} K^{(m)} \subseteq \bigcap_{m=1}^{\infty} (\bigcup_{n=m}^{\infty} K_n) = \{0\}.$$

Denote by (e'_k) the sequence in E' biorthogonal to (e_k) . Identify each element $a = (a_k)$ in K with the functional $\sum a_k e'_k$ in E' . Because of (2) and (3), K (thus identified) is a subset of the unit ball of E' . Since K is pointwise compact, it is a $\sigma(E', E)$ -compact subset of E' . Moreover, $K^{(\omega)} \subseteq \{0\}$ in the $\sigma(E', E)$ -topology. By a result of Semadeni (cf. [3, Corollary 5.2]), we see that K is homeomorphic to $\alpha + 1$ for some ordinal $\alpha \leq \omega$. It follows from (2) and (3) that E embeds into $C(K)$. Therefore,

$$E \hookrightarrow C(\alpha) \hookrightarrow C(\omega^\omega),$$

as required. $\square$

In Theorem 12, if each ρ_n is the ℓ^1 -norm, then the resulting space is called a *Marcinkiewicz sequence space*. If, in addition, we let $t_n = n^{\frac{1}{p}-1}$, $1 < p < \infty$, then we obtain the closed linear span of the unit vectors in weak ℓ^p .

Corollary 13. *Every Marcinkiewicz sequence space is isomorphic to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$. In particular, the closed linear span of the unit vectors in weak ℓ^p is isomorphic to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$.*

Next, we turn to the class of Orlicz sequence spaces. An Orlicz function is an increasing, convex function $M : [0, \infty) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that $M(0) = 0$ and $M(1) = 1$. It is *nondegenerate* if $M(t) > 0$ for all $t > 0$. The corresponding *Orlicz sequence space* h_M is the space of all real sequences (a_k) such that $\sum_k M(c|a_k|) < \infty$ for all $c < \infty$, endowed with the norm

$$\|(a_k)\| = \inf\{\rho > 0 : \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} M(|a_k|/\rho) \leq 1\}.$$

It is well known that the coordinate unit vectors form a normalized 1-symmetric basis of h_M . Moreover, the dual h'_M of h_M can be identified with the collection of all real sequences (b_k) such that $\langle (a_k), (b_k) \rangle = \sum a_k b_k < \infty$ for all $(a_k) \in h_M$, $\|(a_k)\| \leq 1$. For further results concerning Orlicz spaces, we refer to [4].

We will show that Theorem 12 is applicable to any Orlicz sequence space h_M such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} M(\eta t)/M(t) = 0$ for some $\eta > 0$. Results concerning when an Orlicz space is a Marcinkiewicz space are known;

see, for instance, [6]. It can be seen that there are Orlicz sequence spaces which satisfy the above condition, but are not isomorphic to any Marcinkiewicz space.

Lemma 14. *Let (e_k) be a normalized 1-symmetric basis of a Banach space E , and assume that (e_k) is not equivalent to the ℓ^1 -basis. Denote by (e'_k) the functionals biorthogonal to (e_k) . Let $\xi > 0$ be given. For any $\epsilon > 0$, there exists $\delta = \delta(\epsilon) > 0$ such that if $x \in E$,*

$$\|x\| \geq \xi, \quad \|x\|_\infty \leq \delta,$$

then there exists $x' \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$,

$$\|x'\| \leq 1, \quad \|x'\|_\infty \leq \epsilon, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle x, x' \rangle \geq \frac{\xi}{2}.$$

Proof. Suppose $\epsilon > 0$ is given. Since (e_k) is not equivalent to the ℓ^1 -basis, there exists $k_0 \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|\sum_{k \in A} e'_k\| > 1/\epsilon$ if $|A| \geq k_0$. Let $\delta = \xi(4k_0)^{-1}$. If $x \in E$, $\|x\| \geq \xi$, and $\|x\|_\infty \leq \delta$, there exists $\sum b_k e'_k \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$, $\|\sum b_k e'_k\| \leq 1$, such that $\langle x, \sum b_k e'_k \rangle \geq 3\xi/4$. Let $A = \{k : |b_k| > \epsilon\}$. Since $\|\sum_{k \in A} e'_k\| \leq \epsilon^{-1} \|\sum b_k e'_k\| \leq 1/\epsilon$, $|A| < k_0$ by the choice of k_0 . Then

$$|\langle x, \sum_{k \in A} b_k e'_k \rangle| \leq \|x\|_\infty \sum_{k \in A} |b_k| \leq \delta |A| < \delta k_0 \leq \frac{\xi}{4}.$$

If we let $x' = \sum_{k \notin A} b_k e'_k$, then $x' \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$, $\|x'\| \leq 1$, $\|x'\|_\infty \leq \epsilon$, and

$$\langle x, x' \rangle \geq \langle x, \sum b_k e'_k \rangle - |\langle x, \sum_{k \in A} b_k e'_k \rangle| \geq \xi/2.$$

This proves the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 15. *Let M be a nondegenerate Orlicz function. Suppose that there exists $\eta > 0$ so that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} M(\eta t)/M(t) = 0$. There is a real sequence $(\delta_n)_{n=1}^\infty$, strictly decreasing to 0, such that whenever $a = (a_k)$ is an element in h_M of norm $1/\eta$, then either $\|a\|_\infty > \delta_1$, or there exists an $n \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $\|a\chi_{A_n}\| \geq 1$, where $A_n = \{k : \delta_{n+1} < |a_k| \leq \delta_n\}$.*

Proof. Choose a strictly decreasing sequence $(\delta_n)_{n=1}^\infty$ such that $\delta_1 < 1$, and $M(\eta t) < M(t)/2^n$ if $0 < t \leq \delta_n$, $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If the lemma fails, there exists $a = (a_k) \in h_M$ of norm $1/\eta$ such that $\|a\|_\infty \leq \delta_1$ and $\|a\chi_{A_n}\| < 1$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Note that $\text{supp } a \subseteq \cup_{n=1}^\infty A_n$, and $\sum_{k \in A_n} M(|a_k|) < 1$ for all n . Now if $k \in A_n$, then $0 < |a_k| \leq \delta_n$, hence $M(\eta|a_k|) < M(|a_k|)/2^n$.

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} M(\eta|a_k|) &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k \in A_n} M(\eta|a_k|) \\
&< \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{k \in A_n} M(|a_k|) \\
&< \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2^n} = 1.
\end{aligned}$$

But this contradicts the fact that $\|a\| = 1/\eta$. The lemma follows. $\square$

Theorem 16. *Let M be a nondegenerate Orlicz function. Suppose that there exists $\eta > 0$ so that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} M(\eta t)/M(t) = 0$. Then the Orlicz sequence space h_M is isomorphic to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$.*

Proof. As before, let (e_k) be the unit vector basis of h_M , and let (e'_k) be the sequence of biorthogonal functionals. The assumption on the Orlicz function M easily implies that h_M is not isomorphic to ℓ^1 . Taking $\xi = 1$, we obtain the function δ from Lemma 14. It follows from the proof of Lemma 15 that the sequence $(\delta_n)_{n=1}^{\infty}$ from that lemma can be chosen to satisfy the additional condition that $0 < \delta_n < \delta(2^{-n})$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, choose $l_n \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $\delta_{n+1} \|\sum_{k=1}^{l_n} e_k\| > 1/\eta$. Let B_n be the subset of $\mathbb{R}^{l_n}$ consisting of all sequences $(b_k)_{k=1}^{l_n}$ such that

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \geq b_1 \geq b_2 \geq \cdots \geq b_{l_n} \geq 0$$

and

$$\left\| \sum_{k=1}^{l_n} b_k e'_k \right\| \leq 1.$$

Finally, let ρ_n be the norm on $\mathbb{R}^{l_n}$ defined by

$$\rho_n(a_1, \dots, a_{l_n}) = 2^n \sup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{l_n} a_k^* b_k : (b_1, \dots, b_{l_n}) \in B_n \right\}.$$

Clearly, each ρ_n is a lattice norm. Moreover, each ρ_n is a normalized norm. Indeed, since $(1/2^n, 0, \dots, 0) \in B_n$, we see that

$$\rho_n(a_1, \dots, a_{l_n}) \geq 2^n \left(\frac{a_1^*}{2^n} \right) = a_1^* = \|(a_1, \dots, a_{l_n})\|_{\infty}.$$

On the other hand,

$$\rho_n(a_1, \dots, a_{l_n}) \leq 2^n \cdot \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot \sum_{k=1}^{l_n} a_k^* = \|(a_1, \dots, a_{l_n})\|_1,$$

since $\|(b_1, \dots, b_{l_n})\|_\infty \leq 1/2^n$ for all $(b_1, \dots, b_{l_n}) \in B_n$. This shows that ρ_n is a normalized lattice norm. Next, we claim that if $a = \sum_{k=1}^\infty a_k e_k \in h_M$, then

$$\sup_n \frac{1}{2^n} \rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_{l_n}^*) \leq \|a\| \leq \max\left\{\frac{1}{\eta \delta_1} \|a\|_\infty, \frac{2}{\eta} \sup_n \frac{1}{2^n} \rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_{l_n}^*)\right\}. \quad (4)$$

Let $n \in \mathbb{N}$. If $(b_1, \dots, b_{l_n}) \in B_n$, then $\|\sum_{k=1}^{l_n} b_k e'_k\| \leq 1$. Therefore,

$$\rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_{l_n}^*) \leq 2^n \left\| \sum_{k=1}^\infty a_k^* e_k \right\| = 2^n \|a\|.$$

This proves the left half of (4). If $\|a\| = 1/\eta$, define the sets A_n as in Lemma 15 using the sequence (δ_n) . By the same lemma, either $\|a\|_\infty > \delta_1$, or there exists n_0 such that $\|a\chi_{A_{n_0}}\| \geq 1$. In the latter case, we also observe that $\|a\chi_{A_{n_0}}\|_\infty \leq \delta_{n_0} < \delta(2^{-n_0})$. Hence Lemma 14 yields $x' = \sum_{k=1}^\infty c_k e'_k \in h'_M$ such that

$$\|x'\| \leq 1, \quad \|x'\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{2^{n_0}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle a\chi_{A_{n_0}}, x' \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Notice that since $\delta_{n_0+1} \|\chi_{A_{n_0}}\| \leq \|a\| = 1/\eta$, $|A_{n_0}| < l_{n_0}$. Let $c = (c_1^*, \dots, c_{l_{n_0}}^*)$. Since $\|x'\| \leq 1$ and $\|x'\|_\infty \leq 1/2^{n_0}$, $c \in B_{n_0}$. But then

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2^{n_0}} \rho_{n_0}(a_1^*, \dots, a_{l_{n_0}}^*) &\geq \sum_{k=1}^{l_{n_0}} a_k^* c_k^* \\ &\geq \sum_{k \in A_{n_0}} a_k c_k \\ &= \langle a\chi_{A_{n_0}}, x' \rangle \geq \frac{1}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, if $\|a\| = 1/\eta$, then either $\|a\|_\infty > \delta_1$ or $\sup_n \frac{1}{2^n} \rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_{l_n}^*) \geq 1/2$. The right half of inequality (4) follows immediately. From (4), one easily deduces that the norm on h_M is equivalent to the norm ρ defined by

$$\rho(a) = \sup_n \frac{1}{2^n} \rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_{l_n}^*)$$

for $a = (a_k)$. We may now apply Theorem 12 to conclude that h_M is isomorphic to a subspace of $C(\omega^\omega)$. $\square$

4. SYMMETRIC SEQUENCE SPACES

If E is a Banach space, a subset W of the dual space is *norming* if there is a strictly positive constant C such that

$$C^{-1} \sup_{x' \in W} |\langle x, x' \rangle| \leq \|x\| \leq C \sup_{x' \in W} |\langle x, x' \rangle|$$

for every $x \in E$. The proof of the next proposition is left to the reader.

Proposition 17. *A Banach space E is isomorphic to a subspace of $C(K)$ for some compact Hausdorff topological space K if and only if E' contains a norming subset W which is a continuous image of K when endowed with the weak* topology.*

To be able to use Theorem 3, we would like to shift our focus from the norming subset W to the collection of supports of the functionals in W (assuming that E is a sequence space). Lemma 18 shows how to perturb the set W so as to obtain finite supports. Then we use Lemma 19 to “discretize” the coordinates of the functionals to ensure that the set of supports is a compact subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$.

Lemma 18. *Suppose that (e_k) is a shrinking unconditional basis of a Banach space E , with biorthogonal functionals (e'_k) , and let α be a countable ordinal. Given a continuous function $f : \alpha + 1 \rightarrow (E', \text{weak}^*)$, and $\epsilon > 0$, there is a continuous map $g : \alpha + 1 \rightarrow (E', \text{weak}^*)$ such that $g(\beta) \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$ and $\|f(\beta) - g(\beta)\| \leq \epsilon$ for all $\beta \leq \alpha$.*

Proof. Induct on $\alpha < \omega_1$. The result is trivial if α is a finite ordinal. Now suppose it holds for all $\beta < \alpha$, where $0 < \alpha < \omega_1$. Assume that $f : \alpha + 1 \rightarrow (E', \text{weak}^*)$ is continuous, and let $\epsilon > 0$ be given. First, consider the case when α is a successor ordinal, say $\alpha = \gamma + 1$. By the inductive hypothesis, there exists a continuous function $g : \gamma + 1 \rightarrow (E', \text{weak}^*)$ such that $g(\beta) \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$, and $\|f(\beta) - g(\beta)\| \leq \epsilon$ for all $\beta \leq \gamma$. Since (e_k) is shrinking, there exists $y'_\alpha \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$ such that $\|f(\alpha) - y'_\alpha\| \leq \epsilon$. Extend g by defining $g(\alpha) = y'_\alpha$. It is clear that g satisfies the requirements of the lemma.

Suppose that α is a limit ordinal. Since $\alpha < \omega_1$, there is a sequence of ordinals (α_n) which strictly increases to α . Choose $y'_\alpha \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$ such that $\|f(\alpha) - y'_\alpha\| \leq \epsilon/2$. Define $h : \alpha + 1 \rightarrow (E', \text{weak}^*)$ by $h(\beta) = f(\beta) + y'_\alpha - f(\alpha)$ for all $\beta \leq \alpha$. h is clearly continuous. By the inductive hypothesis, for each n , there is a continuous function $g_n : \{\beta : \alpha_{n-1} < \beta \leq \alpha_n\} \rightarrow (E', \text{weak}^*)$ such that $g_n(\beta) \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$, and $\|h(\beta) - g_n(\beta)\| \leq \epsilon/2^n$ whenever $\alpha_{n-1} < \beta \leq \alpha_n$. (We interpret

$\alpha_0 < \beta$ to mean $0 \leq \beta$.) Now define $g : \alpha + 1 \rightarrow (E', \text{weak}^*)$ by

$$g(\beta) = \begin{cases} g_n(\beta) & \text{if } \alpha_{n-1} < \beta \leq \alpha_n, n \in \mathbb{N}, \\ y'_\alpha & \text{if } \beta = \alpha. \end{cases}$$

It is clear that $g(\beta) \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$ for all $\beta \leq \alpha$. Moreover, g is continuous at every $\beta < \alpha$. We claim that it is continuous at α as well. This follows from the observations that $\lim_{\beta \uparrow \alpha} \|g(\beta) - h(\beta)\| = 0$, and $\lim_{\beta \uparrow \alpha} h(\beta) = h(\alpha) = y'_\alpha$ in the weak* topology. Finally, if $\beta < \alpha$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|f(\beta) - g(\beta)\| &\leq \|f(\beta) - h(\beta)\| + \|h(\beta) - g(\beta)\| \\ &\leq \|f(\alpha) - y'_\alpha\| + \frac{\epsilon}{2} \leq \epsilon, \end{aligned}$$

while $\|f(\alpha) - g(\alpha)\| = \|f(\alpha) - y'_\alpha\| \leq \epsilon$ as well. This completes the proof of the lemma. $\square$

Lemma 19. *Let A be a countable compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$ which contains 0, and suppose $\epsilon > 0$ is given. Then there is a continuous function $h : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which takes only finitely many values, such that $h(0) = 0$, and $|h(a) - a| \leq \epsilon$ for all $a \in A$.*

Proof. Choose l large enough that $A \subseteq [-l\epsilon/2, l\epsilon/2]$. If $-l \leq k \leq l$, choose a number $b_k \in [k\epsilon/2, (k+1)\epsilon/2] \setminus A$. For convenience, let $b_{-l-1} = (-l-1)\epsilon/2$. Define $g : A \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ by

$$g(a) = b_k \quad \text{if } b_{k-1} < a \leq b_k, \quad -l \leq k \leq l.$$

Since $|b_k - b_{k-1}| < \epsilon$, $|g(a) - a| < \epsilon$ for all $a \in A$. Suppose (a_n) is a sequence in A which converges to some $a \in A$. Choose k such that $b_{k-1} < a \leq b_k$. Since $a \in A$, but $b_k \notin A$, $b_{k-1} < a < b_k$. Hence $b_{k-1} < a_n < b_k$ for all large enough n . This proves that g is continuous. Clearly, g takes only finitely many values. Now define the function H on the range of g by

$$H(g(a)) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } g(a) = g(0), \\ g(a) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Finally, let $h = H \circ g$. Clearly, h is continuous on A , takes only finitely many values, and $h(0) = 0$. If $g(a) = g(0)$, then a and 0 lies within the same interval $(b_{k-1}, b_k]$, hence $|a| \leq \epsilon$. Therefore, $|h(a) - a| = |a| \leq \epsilon$. If $g(a) \neq g(0)$, then $|h(a) - a| = |g(a) - a| \leq \epsilon$. $\square$

Proposition 20. *Suppose that (e_k) is an unconditional basis of a Banach space E which embeds into $C(\omega^\alpha)$ for some countable ordinal α .*

There exist a compact, hereditary subset K of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$, $K^{(\alpha+1)} = \emptyset$, and a constant $\eta > 0$ such that for every $\sum a_k e_k \in E$,

$$\eta \left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| \leq \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{k \in A} a_k e_k \right\| : A \in K \right\}.$$

Proof. By suitable renorming, we may assume that both the basis (e_k) and the sequence of biorthogonal functionals (e'_k) are normalized. Since E embeds into $C(\omega^\alpha)$, the basis (e_k) must be shrinking [2]. Using Proposition 17 and Lemma 18, we obtain a continuous function $f : \omega^\alpha + 1 \rightarrow (E', \text{weak}^*)$ such that $f(\beta) \in \text{span}\{(e'_k)\}$ for all $\beta \leq \omega^\alpha$, and that $f(\omega^\alpha + 1)$ is a norming subset of E' . After appropriate scaling, we may assume that there is a constant $\eta > 0$ such that

$$2\eta \|x\| \leq \sup_{\beta \leq \omega^\alpha} |\langle x, f(\beta) \rangle| \leq \|x\|$$

for all $x \in E$. Each $f(\beta)$ can be expressed in the form $f(\beta) = \sum_k f_k(\beta) e'_k$. For each k , denote by A_k the set $\{f_k(\beta) : \beta \leq \omega^\alpha\} \cup \{0\}$. Then A_k is a countable compact subset of $\mathbb{R}$. By Lemma 19, there is a continuous function $h_k : A_k \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which takes only finitely many values, such that $h_k(0) = 0$, and $|h_k(a) - a| \leq \eta/3^k$ for all $a \in A_k$. Suppose $\beta \leq \omega^\alpha$, then

$$\sum |h_k(f_k(\beta)) - f_k(\beta)| \|e'_k\| \leq \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\eta}{3^k} = \frac{\eta}{2}.$$

It follows that $h(\beta) \equiv \sum h_k(f_k(\beta)) e'_k$ converges in E' , and that

$$\|h(\beta) - f(\beta)\| \leq \eta/2 \quad \text{for all } \beta \leq \omega^\alpha. \quad (5)$$

We claim that $h : \omega^\alpha + 1 \rightarrow (E', \text{weak}^*)$ is continuous. In fact, $h_k \circ f_k : \omega^\alpha + 1 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a continuous function for every k . Since $h(\omega^\alpha + 1)$ is bounded by (5), the continuity of h follows. Finally, let

$$K = \{A : A \subseteq \text{supp } h(\beta) \text{ for some } \beta \leq \omega^\alpha\}.$$

Since $h_k(0) = 0$, $\text{supp } h(\beta) \subseteq \text{supp } f(\beta)$ for each $\beta \leq \omega^\alpha$. Therefore, $K \subseteq \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$. Obviously K is hereditary.

Claim. If $\gamma \leq \alpha$, and $A \in K^{(\gamma)}$, then there exists $\beta \in (\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\gamma)}$ such that $A \subseteq \text{supp } h(\beta)$.

We prove the claim by induction on γ . If $\gamma = 0$, there is nothing to prove. Suppose that $0 < \gamma_0 \leq \alpha$, and the claim holds for all $\gamma < \gamma_0$. Let $A \in K^{(\gamma_0)}$. Assume first that γ_0 is a successor. Then there is a pairwise distinct sequence (A_n) in $K^{(\gamma_0-1)}$ which converges to A . By the inductive assumption, there is a sequence (β_n) in $(\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\gamma_0-1)}$ such that $A_n \subseteq \text{supp } h(\beta_n)$ for every n . Using a subsequence if necessary,

we may assume that (β_n) converges to some $\beta \in \omega^\alpha + 1$. If $k \in A$, then $k \in A_n$ for all large enough n . Since $\{\langle e_k, h(\gamma) \rangle : \gamma \leq \omega^\alpha\}$ is a finite set, and $\langle e_k, h(\beta) \rangle = \lim_n \langle e_k, h(\beta_n) \rangle$, $k \in \text{supp } h(\beta)$. Hence $A \subseteq \text{supp } h(\beta)$. If $\beta_n = \beta$ for infinitely many n , then $A_n \subseteq \text{supp } h(\beta_n) = \text{supp } h(\beta)$ for infinitely many n . But $\text{supp } h(\beta)$ is finite. Thus (A_n) has a constant subsequence, contrary to its choice. Therefore, $\beta_n \neq \beta$ for all but finitely many n . Thus

$$\beta \in ((\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\gamma_0 - 1)})^{(1)} = (\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\gamma_0)}.$$

Now consider the case when γ_0 is a limit ordinal. Since $A \in K^{(\gamma_0)}$, $A \in K^{(\gamma)}$ for all $\gamma < \gamma_0$. By induction, for each $\gamma < \gamma_0$, there exists $\beta_\gamma \in (\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\gamma)}$ such that $A \subseteq \text{supp } h(\beta_\gamma)$. There is a sequence of ordinals (γ_n) which strictly increases to γ_0 , such that (β_{γ_n}) converges to some β . It is easy to see that $\beta \in (\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\gamma_0)}$. If $k \in A$, then $\langle e_k, h(\beta_{\gamma_n}) \rangle \neq 0$. Arguing as before, we see that $\langle e_k, h(\beta) \rangle \neq 0$, i.e., $k \in \text{supp } h(\beta)$. Therefore, $A \subseteq \text{supp } h(\beta)$. This proves the claim.

In particular, according to the claim, if $A \in K^{(1)}$, then there exists $\beta \in (\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(1)}$ such that $A \subseteq \text{supp } h(\beta)$. Thus $A \subseteq \text{supp } h(\beta)$, where $\beta \in \omega^\alpha + 1$. Hence $A \in K$. Therefore K is a closed subset of $\mathcal{P}(\mathbb{N})$, and must be compact. Using the claim again, we see that any $A \in K^{(\alpha)}$ is a subset of $\text{supp } h(\beta)$ for some $\beta \in (\omega^\alpha + 1)^{(\alpha)} = \{\omega^\alpha\}$. So $K^{(\alpha)}$ is finite, from which it follows that $K^{(\alpha+1)} = \emptyset$. Summarizing, we see that K is a compact, hereditary subset of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$ such that $K^{(\alpha+1)} = \emptyset$. Finally, if $\sum a_k e_k \in E$,

$$2\eta \left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| \leq \sup_{\beta \in \omega^\alpha + 1} |\langle \sum a_k e_k, f(\beta) \rangle|.$$

Using (5), we see that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{3}{2}\eta \left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| &\leq \sup_{\beta \in \omega^\alpha + 1} |\langle \sum a_k e_k, h(\beta) \rangle| \\ &\leq \sup_{\beta \in \omega^\alpha + 1} \left\| \sum_{k \in \text{supp } h(\beta)} a_k e_k \right\| \|h(\beta)\| \\ &\leq \frac{3}{2} \sup_{\beta \in \omega^\alpha + 1} \left\| \sum_{k \in \text{supp } h(\beta)} a_k e_k \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

since $\|h(\beta)\| \leq \|f(\beta)\| + \eta/2 \leq 1 + 1/2$. As $\text{supp } h(\beta) \in K$ for all $\beta \in \omega^\alpha + 1$,

$$\eta \left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| \leq \sup_{A \in K} \left\| \sum_{k \in A} a_k e_k \right\|.$$

This proves the proposition. $\square$

5. SYMMETRIC SEQUENCE SUBSPACES OF $C(\alpha)$

In this section, we prove the converses to the embedding theorems, Theorems 12 and 16. In both instances, we rely on the characterization of the norm provided by Proposition 20. Then Theorem 3 is used to analyze the resulting set K . Two norms $\|\cdot\|$ and ρ on a vector space E are said to be *equivalent* if $(E, \|\cdot\|)$ and (E, ρ) are isomorphic via the formal identity map.

Theorem 21. *Let (e_k) be a symmetric basis of a Banach space E which embeds into $C(\omega^\omega)$. Then there are a strictly positive real sequence (t_n) which decreases to 0, and for each n , a normalized lattice norm ρ_n on $\mathbb{R}^n$ such that the norm on E is equivalent to*

$$\rho\left(\sum a_k e_k\right) = \sup_n t_n \rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_n^*).$$

Proof. Without loss of generality, we may assume that the sequence (e_k) is normalized and 1-symmetric. Since (e_k) is unconditional, and E embeds into $C(\omega^\omega)$, (e_k) is shrinking. By Proposition 20, there are a compact hereditary subset K of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$, $K^{(\omega+1)} = \emptyset$, and $\eta > 0$ such that

$$\eta \left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| \leq \sup \left\{ \left\| \sum_{k \in A} a_k e_k \right\| : A \in K \right\}$$

for every $\sum a_k e_k \in E$. By Theorem 3, there exist $B \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(\mathbb{N})$, and $f : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$, strictly increasing to ∞ , such that $|A \cap B| \leq f(\min(A \cap B))$ whenever $A \in K$. List the elements of B in a strictly increasing sequence (j_k) . Then, for every $\sum a_k e_k \in E$

$$\begin{aligned} \eta \left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| &= \eta \left\| \sum a_k^* e_{j_k} \right\| \\ &\leq \sup \left\{ \left\| \left(\sum a_k^* e_{j_k} \right) \chi_A \right\| : A \in K \right\} \\ &= \sup \left\{ \left\| \left(\sum a_k^* e_{j_k} \right) \chi_{A \cap B} \right\| : A \in K \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_n \left\| \sum_{k=n}^{n+f(n)-1} a_k^* e_k \right\|, \end{aligned}$$

since $|A \cap B| \leq f(\min(A \cap B))$ for all $A \in K$. If $\sup_n \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n e_k \right\| < \infty$, then (e_k) is equivalent to the c_0 basis. We can simply take (t_n) to be any strictly positive sequence decreasing to 0, and $\rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_n^*) = \|(a_1^*, \dots, a_n^*)\|_\infty$ for all n . Otherwise, assume that $\lambda_n \equiv \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n e_k \right\| \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$. Using Lemma 14, find a strictly positive sequence (t_n) which decreases to 0, such that if $x \in E$, $\|x\| \geq \eta/2$, $\|x\|_\infty \leq 1/\lambda_n$, then there exists $x' \in E'$, $\|x'\| \leq 1$, $\|x'\|_\infty \leq t_n$, and $\langle x, x' \rangle \geq \eta/4$. Of

course, t_1 may be chosen to be ≤ 1 . For each n , define the lattice norm ρ_n on $\mathbb{R}^{f(n)}$ by

$$\rho_n(a_1, \dots, a_{f(n)}) = \frac{1}{t_n} \sup \left\{ \sum_{k=1}^{f(n)} a_k^* b_k : \|(b_k)\|_\infty \leq t_n, \quad \left\| \sum b_k e'_k \right\| \leq 1 \right\}.$$

It is easy to check that ρ_n is a normalized lattice norm for every n . Now if $\left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| = 1$, choose n (depending on $\sum a_k e_k$) such that $\left\| \sum_{k=n}^{n+f(n)-1} a_k^* e_k \right\| \geq \eta/2$. Note that

$$1 = \left\| \sum a_k^* e_k \right\| \geq \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n a_k^* e_k \right\| = a_n^* \left\| \sum_{k=1}^n e_k \right\|.$$

Hence $a_n^* \leq 1/\lambda_n$. By the choice of t_n , and the definition of ρ_n , $\rho_n(a_n^*, \dots, a_{n+f(n)-1}^*) \geq \eta/(4t_n)$. Thus

$$\rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_{f(n)}^*) \geq \rho_n(a_n^*, \dots, a_{n+f(n)-1}^*) \geq \frac{\eta}{4t_n}.$$

Therefore, for any $\sum a_k e_k \in E$,

$$\frac{\eta}{4} \left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\| \leq \sup_n t_n \rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_{f(n)}^*).$$

It follows easily that the norm $\left\| \sum a_k e_k \right\|$ is equivalent to $\sup_n t_n \rho_n(a_1^*, \dots, a_{f(n)}^*)$. The conclusion of the theorem is now clear. $\square$

We now turn to the converse of Theorem 16. Let M be a given Orlicz function. If $x = (t_1, t_2, \dots)$ is a finitely supported real sequence, let $\Phi(x) = \sum M(|t_k|)$. Let the countable limit ordinal α be fixed until the end of Proposition 22. Recall the function b_α , and the sets $\mathcal{A}_\beta^f$, $\beta < \alpha$, associated with α .

Definition. Suppose that a quadruple (f, M, S, B) is given, where $f \in \mathcal{F}$, M is a nondegenerate Orlicz function, $S \subseteq (0, \infty)$, $\inf S = 0$, and $B \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$. Let a be a positive real number. A *level 0 block of size a* (with respect to (f, M, S, B)) is a vector of the form $x = t\chi_C$, where $C \in \mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(B)$, $t \in S$, $|C| \geq 1$, and $a/2 \leq \Phi(t) \leq a$. If $\beta < \alpha$, a *level $\beta + 1$ block of size a* is a vector of the form $x = \sum_{i=1}^p x_i$, where each x_i is a level β block of size a/p , $x_1 < x_2 < \dots < x_p$, and $[f(\min(\text{supp } x))]^2 \leq p$. Finally, if $\beta \in I_\alpha$, a *level β block of size a* is a vector x such that x is a level $b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min(\text{supp } x)))$ block of size a .

The reader can easily check that if x is a level β block of size a , then $a/2 \leq \Phi(x) \leq a$. These blocks are constructed so that the support of a level β block is “long” when compared with any element in $\mathcal{A}_\beta^f$.

which preceeds it. Now suppose that a quadruple (f, M, S, B) is given. Assume additionally that

$$\sum_{i=m}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(f(i))^2} \leq \frac{2}{(f(m))^2}, \quad \text{and} \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{f(m)}{(f(m+1))^2} \leq \frac{1}{4} \quad (7)$$

for all $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proposition 22. *Suppose that $\beta < \alpha$, and x is a level β block of size a , $A \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta}^f$, and $\min A < \min(\text{supp } x)$. Then*

$$\Phi(x\chi_A) \leq \frac{2af(\min A)}{[f(\min(\text{supp } x))]^2}.$$

Proof. The proposition clearly holds for $\beta = 0$, since in this case the sets A and $\text{supp } x$ are disjoint. Assume it holds for some $\beta < \alpha$. We want to show that it also holds for $\beta + 1$. Suppose x is a level $\beta + 1$ block of size a , $A \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta+1}^f$, and $\min A < \min(\text{supp } x)$. Write $A = \cup_{i=1}^k A_i$, where $A_1 < \dots < A_k$, $A_1, \dots, A_k \in \mathcal{A}_{\beta}^f$, and $k \leq f(\min A)$. Also $x = \sum_{i=1}^p x_i$, where each x_i is a level β block of size a/p , $x_1 < \dots < x_p$, and $[f(\min(\text{supp } x))]^2 \leq p$. For each A_j , let

$$I_j = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq p, \quad \text{supp } x_i \cap A_j \neq \emptyset\}.$$

For each j , there is at most one $i_j \in I_j$ such that $\min(\text{supp } x_{i_j}) \leq \min A_j$. If no such i_j exists, we let $x_{i_j} = 0$. Then

$$x\chi_{A_j} = x_{i_j}\chi_{A_j} + \sum_{\substack{i \in I_j \\ i \neq i_j}} x_i\chi_{A_j}.$$

Notice that if $i \in I_j$, $i \neq i_j$, then $\min A_j < \min(\text{supp } x_i)$. Therefore, the inductive assumption applies to x_i and A_j . We conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{\substack{i \in I_j \\ i \neq i_j}} \Phi(x_i\chi_{A_j}) &\leq \sum_{\substack{i \in I_j \\ i \neq i_j}} \frac{2af(\min A_j)}{p[f(\min(\text{supp } x_i))]^2} \\ &\leq \frac{2af(\min A_j)}{p} \sum_{i=\min A_j+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(f(i))^2} \\ &\leq \frac{4af(\min A_j)}{p[f(\min A_j + 1)]^2} \leq \frac{a}{p}. \end{aligned}$$

Here we have used the growth conditions (6) and (7) on the last two inequalities. Since $\Phi(x_{i_j}\chi_{A_j}) \leq \Phi(x_{i_j}) \leq a/p$, it follows that $\Phi(x\chi_{A_j}) \leq$

$2a/p$. Therefore,

$$\Phi(x\chi_A) = \sum_{j=1}^k \Phi(x\chi_{A_j}) \leq \frac{2ka}{p} \leq \frac{2af(\min A)}{[f(\min(\text{supp } x))]^2}.$$

Finally, suppose that $\beta \in I_\alpha$, and the proposition holds for all ordinals $\gamma < \beta$. If $A \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$, and x is a level β block of size a such that $\min A < \min(\text{supp } x)$, then $A \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min A))}^f$, and x is a level $b_\alpha(\beta, f(\min(\text{supp } x)))$ block of size a . Let $m = f(\min A)$, and $n = f(\min(\text{supp } x))$. Then $m < n$. Thus $A \in \mathcal{A}_{b_\alpha(\beta, n)}^f$ by Theorem 11. Since the proposition is assumed to hold for the ordinal $b_\alpha(\beta, n)$, we see that

$$\Phi(x\chi_A) \leq \frac{2af(\min A)}{[f(\min(\text{supp } x))]^2}.$$

This completes the proof of the proposition. $\square$

Proposition 23. *Let M be a nondegenerate Orlicz function. Suppose that there exist a compact, hereditary subset K of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$, and a constant $\eta > 0$ such that*

$$\eta \|a\|_M \leq \sup\{\|a\chi_A\|_M : A \in K\} \quad (8)$$

whenever $a \in h_M$. Then $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} M(\eta t/2)/M(t) = 0$.

Proof. Assume that the proposition fails. Then there are a set $S \subseteq (0, \infty)$, $\inf S = 0$, and a $\theta > 0$ such that $M(\eta t/2) \geq \theta M(t)$ for all $t \in S$. Since K is countable compact, there is a countable ordinal β such that $K^{(\omega^\beta + 1)} = \emptyset$. Choose a countable limit ordinal α such that $\beta < \alpha$. Define the sets A_γ^f for all $\gamma < \alpha$ using the function b_α . By Theorem 3, there exist $B \in \mathcal{P}_\infty(\mathbb{N})$, and a function $f \in \mathcal{F}$, such that $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$ for all $A \in K$. Because of Proposition 2, it may be assumed that the growth conditions (6) and (7) hold. Using the quadruple (f, M, S, B) thus obtained, construct vectors $x_1 < x_2 < \dots$ such that x_k is a level β block of size 1 for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$. If $A \in K$, then $A \cap B \in \mathcal{A}_\beta^f$. Let $I = \{k \in \mathbb{N} : \text{supp } x_k \cap A \neq \emptyset\}$. There is at most one $k_0 \in I$ such that $\min(\text{supp } x_{k_0}) \leq \min(A \cap B)$. If $k \in I$, $k \neq k_0$, then $\min(A \cap B) < \min(\text{supp } x_k)$. Appeal to Proposition 22 to see that

$$\Phi(x_k\chi_A) = \Phi(x_k\chi_{A \cap B}) \leq \frac{2f(\min(A \cap B))}{[f(\min(\text{supp } x_k))]^2}.$$

On the other hand, $\Phi(x_{k_0}\chi_A) \leq \Phi(x_{k_0}) \leq 1$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k \in I} \Phi(x_k \chi_A) &= \Phi(x_{k_0} \chi_A) + \sum_{\substack{k \in I \\ k \neq k_0}} \Phi(x_k \chi_A) \\ &\leq 1 + 2f(\min(A \cap B)) \sum_{i=\min(A \cap B)+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(f(i))^2} \\ &\leq 1 + \frac{4f(\min(A \cap B))}{[f(\min(A \cap B) + 1)]^2} \leq 2. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, for all $j < \infty$, $\Phi((\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^j x_k) \chi_A) \leq 1$. It follows that $\|(\frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^j x_k) \chi_A\| \leq 1$. From the hypothesis, we conclude that $\frac{\eta}{2} \|\sum_{k=1}^j x_k\| \leq 1$. This in turn implies that

$$\sum_{k=1}^j \Phi\left(\frac{\eta}{2} x_k\right) = \Phi\left(\frac{\eta}{2} \sum_{k=1}^j x_k\right) \leq 1$$

for all j . However, since every nonzero coordinate of x_k belongs to S , $\Phi(\eta x_k/2) \geq \theta \Phi(x_k) \geq \theta/2$. We have reached a contradiction. $\square$

Theorem 24. *The following statements are equivalent for every non-degenerate Orlicz function M :*

1. *There exists a constant $\eta > 0$ such that $\lim_{t \rightarrow 0} M(\eta t)/M(t) = 0$,*
2. *The Orlicz sequence space h_M embeds into $C(\omega^\omega)$,*
3. *The Orlicz sequence space h_M embeds into $C(\alpha)$ for some countable ordinal α .*

Proof. The implication (1) $\Rightarrow$ (2) is Theorem 16. (2) $\Rightarrow$ (3) is obvious. If (3) holds, according to Proposition 20, there are a compact, hereditary subset K of $\mathcal{P}_{<\infty}(\mathbb{N})$, and an $\eta > 0$ such that inequality (8) of Proposition 23 holds. Condition (1) follows from the same proposition. $\square$

REFERENCES

- [1] JAMES DUGUNDJI, *Topology*, Allyn and Bacon, Inc., Boston, 1966.
- [2] R. C. JAMES, Bases and reflexivity of Banach spaces, *Ann. Math.* **52**(1950), 518-527.
- [3] H. ELTON LACEY, *The Isometric Theory of Classical Banach Spaces*, Springer-Verlag, 1974.
- [4] JORAM LINDENSTRAUSS AND LIOR TZAFRIRI, *Classical Banach Spaces I*, Springer-Verlag, 1977.
- [5] STEFAN MAZURKIEWICZ AND W. SIERPIŃSKI, *Contribution à la topologie des ensembles dénombrables*, *Fund. Math.* **1**(1920), 17-27.

- [6] STEPHEN J. MONTGOMERY-SMITH, *Comparison of Orlicz-Lorentz spaces*, Studia Math. **103**(1992), 161-189.
- [7] E. ODELL, *On quotients of Banach spaces having shrinking unconditional bases*, Illinois J. Math. **39**(1995), 15-29.
- [8] J. SCHRIER, *Ein Gegenbespiel zur Theorie der schwachen Konvergenz*, Studia Math. **2**(1930), 58-62.
- [9] Z. SEMADENI, *Banach Spaces of Continuous Functions*, Polish Scientific Publishers, Warszawa, 1971.

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, NATIONAL UNIVERSITY OF SINGAPORE, SINGAPORE 119260

E-mail address: matlhh@math.nus.sg